

MINUTES

MEETING OF:	TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION
DATE OF MEETING:	May 2, 2011 (Regular Meeting)
TIME OF MEETING:	3:00 p.m.
PLACE OF MEETING:	City Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Roney called the Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present:	Chair Guy Roney Vice-Chair Steve Gallagher Commissioner Gordon Cress Commissioner Jairo Valderrama Commissioner Jack Cumming
-----------------	--

Absent:	None
----------------	------

Staff Members Present:	John Kim, Traffic Division Manager Doug Bilse, Traffic Signal Systems Engineer Skip Hammann, Transportation Director Jim Murray, Associate Engineer Lt. Marc Reno, Carlsbad Police Department
-------------------------------	---

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 7, 2011

ACTION:	Motion by Vice-Chair Gallagher, and duly seconded by Commissioner Cumming, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on March 7, 2011, as presented.
VOTE:	3-0-2
AYES:	Roney, Gallagher, Cumming
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	Valderrama, Cress

April 4, 2011

ACTION: Motion by Commissioner Cress, and duly seconded by Vice-Chair Gallagher, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on April 4, 2011, as presented.

VOTE: 3-0-2

AYES: Valderrama, Cress, Gallagher

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Roney, Cumming

ITEM 4 – ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

ITEM 5 – PREVIOUS BUSINESS:

None.

ITEM 6 – NEW BUSINESS:**ITEM 6A: Update on La Costa Avenue – El Camino Real to Rancho Santa Fe Road.**

Mr. Kim stated Traffic Signal Systems Engineer, Doug Bilse, will present an update to the La Costa Improvement Plan. This an informational item only, and as such, there can be no action taken today.

Mr. Bilse indicated to the Traffic Safety Commission (TSC) that staff will present updates every time there is a public meeting so the Commissioners will be informed and understand the process staff is going through and therefore be prepared when the item eventually comes to the TSC for review.

On April 28, 2011 the first community meeting was held at Stagecoach Park. Mr. Bilse stated the La Costa Avenue study area is from El Camino Real to Rancho Santa Fe Road. At each end of the La Costa Avenue corridor the roadway will remain in their current configuration of 2 lanes in each direction. It is in between the two ends they need to address several issues. The issues are quality of life, safety, traffic, residential character, speeds, volume, and sight distance.

Mr. Bilse explained that the objective is to develop a cost-effective, community-preferred plan to address traffic speeds and safety on La Costa Avenue in a way that respects the residential character and arterial function of the roadway. The proposed La Costa planning process includes a community

survey, three community meetings, updating the public throughout the process through mailings and website, presentation to the TSC, City Council acceptance, and General Plan and environmental review.

The first community meeting defined the problem, determined objectives, presented design elements, and discussed preferences. The second meeting on May 26, 2011 will review concept plans, determine what works and what doesn't, determine preferences, and evolve new concepts. At the third meeting on June 23, 2011, they will review, revise and finalize the preferred concept plan and discuss phasing and funding options as needed. The consensus plan will then be brought before the TSC at the July or August meeting for review and that determination will be brought before the City Council for acceptance.

Mr. Bilse reviewed the survey responses with the Commission. They included traffic issues, driving concerns, household activities, school children travel, and appropriate devices for La Costa Avenue, such as roundabouts, bulb outs, medians, bike lanes, sidewalks, striping, and signals. He reiterated the difference between safety and liability. There is a need to keep the City out of a liable path, which may be different than the safest path.

There is no plan in place at this moment. It is hard to do a cost estimate when there is no plan in place. However, the preliminary cost of the La Costa Avenue improvements should run between \$1-million to \$4-million. The cost will depend on the number and the types of devices that are implemented. Landscaping is of significant expense. Cost effectiveness of devices is important to the planning process. The current CIP has \$1-million allocated for 5 proposed signals on La Costa Avenue that could be utilized for this project.

DISCUSSION:

Vice-Chair Gallagher asked if the goal of staff was to lower the speed limits and thereby have the liability issue of the City reduced.

Mr. Bilse stated that was correct. There is an inconsistency right now between the stopping sight distance and the speed limit. They don't support each other. For instance, the stopping sight distance when you pull out of a driveway is not adequate given the speed of vehicles. The goal is to reduce the speed and thereby increase safety.

Vice-Chair Gallagher asked if Commissioner Cumming attended the first community meeting.

Commissioner Cumming stated he did attend the community meeting. He felt the meeting was well operated, although there was no announcement of today's TSC meeting mentioned. The breakout format worked very well. People liked being able to sit down one-on-one and hear ideas. La Costa

Avenue is tremendously complicated because it involves pedestrians and bicycles. He was surprised at the percentage of school children in the survey responses. He asked if that was specifically on La Costa Avenue or does that include children going along Levante Street up to the elementary school.

Mr. Bilse indicated that the percentage of school children reflects a general response to that community which would include a lot of children from the Levante Street neighborhood that walk their children to school.

Commissioner Cumming had thought so. The balancing of needs is a tremendous problem, because if you modify La Costa Avenue too much, the drivers will go around to Levante Street. He was surprised how much of the traffic is local. The difference between the Rancho Santa Fe end and the El Camino Real end is 5,900 vehicles – 12,000 at one end and 17,900 at the other end. Many of the 12,000 vehicles are probably local as well, because some people come in and go to their home, and other people going out and out the other end. It appears a large amount of that traffic is local to this segment of La Costa Avenue as opposed to through traffic. That had been a bit of a surprise for him. He admired staff for everything they are doing in trying to build consensus. That is a more difficult process than just coming up with an idea.

Regarding bulb outs or chokers, Mr. Cummings related his encounter with some on Motor Avenue in Los Angeles. The challenge for youngsters bicycling to school, which is the same time as commuters going to work, is that the bicycles would encounter the choker points and the children were diverted into the traffic. He wanted to know if it was possible to have a bicycle cut through on those choker points so that the bicyclists can continue without having to divert into traffic.

Mr. Bilse explained that bulb outs are typically at intersections and there can be some drainage issues. He felt if they put in a channel, you would wind up with a problem of storm water drainage. That is why it is not usually done. Ideally you have the bulb out and the bike lane come out. Having a bike lane terminate because of the bulb out is not acceptable.

Vice-Chair Gallagher mentioned the issue of safety versus liability. The accident rate on La Costa Avenue is significantly less than the expected statewide average. He wanted to know what types of accidents are going to be addressed. For example, how many accidents involve motorists coming out from a driveway? He wanted a sense of that even though we know there is a liability issue, because you know there is already restricted sight distance. What are the demonstrated issues along that street, like pedestrians? How many pedestrians have there actually been a problem with? He wanted a better grasp of the issues that the TSC will have to evaluate when some changes are made in the future. How many mid-block accidents involve motorists coming out from a private driveway?

Mr. Bilse stated Mr. Linke would be showing some graphics. All of that data is on the City's web page. The City inherited La Costa Avenue from the county. If they were to build La Costa Avenue today, knowing what the speed limit is, they would not have allowed driveway access on a road posted 45 miles per hour. It is a liability issue. If you don't have the sight distance for direct access driveways, and you have known this for many years and have gone to City Council several times saying what has to be done, and they have not acted upon that, the judge in the case would say you have lost your design immunity. The fact that we inherited it and it met the standards when it was designed, the City has had enough time to do something about it. That is what is being addressed. What would you do now knowing what the standards are now? For instance, the sidewalks do not meet ADA access requirements. The bike lane is non-existent. Those are the kinds of things they are trying to address.

Vice-Chair Gallagher said it looked like in some areas the curvilinear nature of the roadway and the alignment may restrict sight distance for some of those homes regardless of what measures are taken unless you go into more substantial types of improvement. Looking east of Romeria Street there is striping now which is what was being discussed at the last meeting for eastbound traffic. It still appears that some of those homes have restricted sight distance, because there are signs stating "driveway" and warning speed signs along that segment of roadway. It appears that staff has already tried to make some of these improvements, and are still struggling with that, even where the road has been striped down to one lane.

Mr. Bilse said a warning sign tells a driver of an imminent condition that is in front of them. These are not standard. Warning signs of driveway ahead are not standard signs. Signage does not resolve the problem. The way to solve the problem is to allow the vehicle to nose out far enough that they can see on-coming traffic before they put themselves in peril. Taking out a lane is one easy way to do that, but it comes at the cost of congestion. A road diet is what they have been talking about, but is has not been committed to for the long-term solution.

Vice-Chair Gallagher asked if the hope is that if some sort of striping plan is put into place, all of the homes on both sides of the subject roadway will get adequate sight distance for the prevailing speed.

Mr. Bilse answered yes.

Vice-Chair Gallagher stated that's where the \$4-million comes with the improvements being proposed. Roundabouts have been talked about on Leucadia Boulevard. Roundabouts were not installed at every intersection there. Why do they use stop signs at some locations and roundabouts at other locations? If roundabouts are such a good solution, why not put them at every intersection?

Mr. Bilse stated they ran out of money.

Public Testimony

Chair Roney called for Public Testimony.

Mr. Bilse stated the Commission could state how much time to allot Mr. Linke for public testimony.

Commissioner Cumming asked Mr. Linke how much time he needed to make his full presentation.

Mr. Linke stated the full presentation would take quite awhile, so he would present a modified version in about 10 minutes.

ACTION:	Motion by Commissioner Cumming, and duly seconded by Commissioner Cress, to allow Mr. Linke 10 minutes instead of 5 minutes of Public Testimony.
VOTE:	5-0-0
AYES:	Roney, Gallagher, Valderrama, Cress, Cumming
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Mr. Bilse mentioned the data that Mr. Linke will be providing was given to him from the City. There is no conflict. They have been working together. He really appreciates the effort that Mr. Linke has done, and they are working on this together.

Steve Linke, 7513 Quinta Street, Carlsbad, stated he lives one block off the eastern segment of La Costa Avenue. He became involved after the March 22, 2011 City Council meeting where City Council initiated an expedited process to reduce La Costa Avenue to one traffic lane in each direction (road diet) and design further traffic calming measures. He is concerned about the impact this will have on access to El Camino Real and the I-5. Mr. Bilse has advised him that staff is backing off and are going to conduct an environmental study first before striping to one lane in each direction. Therefore, his presentation has changed because he was originally going to urge the TSC to not recommend this reduction down to one lane.

Mr. Linke indicated there is a need for traffic calming improvements, such as the reducing of liability raised by a recently settled motorcycle accident lawsuit. There are also safety concerns expressed over the last several years by residents who have driveways on the street. Traffic calming will improve livability by creating more of a neighborhood feel to the area. Potential traffic calming inconveniences are the elimination of traffic lanes, plus bulb outs and roundabouts. He would prefer a less disruptive solution that enhances safety of local residents, but avoids elimination of traffic lanes.

In September 2008 the KOA traffic calming study was performed, but it has not been presented officially to anyone. The conclusion of that study is that it recommended against doing a road diet from 4 traffic lanes down to 2 traffic lanes because of congestion problems that were projected. The road diet is not consistent with the La Costa Avenue road classification in the General Plan, which defines it as a secondary arterial with four lanes. In addition, the accident rate on the subject roadway is not high, although there are residential driveways there and we should strive to do better. Just because they are below the national average does not mean it is safe for the residents. But the underlying issue may not be as dire as some people have presented. Traffic volumes have not changed between 1998 and 2011 despite what some people have said. The speeds have actually come down after some new signage was installed.

Mr. Linke also had concerns about the public outreach. The nature of the questions on the survey is very ambiguous. It would have been better to do it in a more direct fashion where the survey says, "Do you think speeds are too high, too low, or just right?" The same is true about parking. "Are you concerned about parking?" Only 9 percent said they were concerned about parking. I may have said I was very concerned about parking because I don't think people should be parking on the street. Another person may have said "I'm very concerned about parking" because they want to park their car there. It is very difficult to interpret some of the questions. Some are so ambiguous that you can't really come to a conclusion based on those questions.

The survey gave no information on the road diet. The City may have purposely not highlighted the fact that most of the traffic calming measures are first going to require the restriction down to one traffic lane in each direction. Because that is a big issue, there should have been more emphasis on that. However, that is mitigated by the fact that they will be taking a slower approach now, so he isn't as concerned about that now.

Regarding the liability issue, Mr. Linke read through about half of the lawsuit at the County Courthouse. His conclusion from that is that the Plaintiff's experts are concerned about the things that Mr. Bilse has talked about. The first is that sight distance is insufficient due to vehicle speed and the installation of the parking lane along the north side where the driveways are. He believes that was done in 1988. The City lost their design immunity because they added a parking lane and they didn't perform a comprehensive design review before. A second issue is the dangerous left hand turns into and out of driveways due to the installation of a two-way left hand turn lane. They went to great lengths to say you are basically inviting people who have those driveways to take dangerous left hand turns. They argued that you should have a solid median and allow only right in/right out of the driveway. That is what he believes to be the primary focus of the lawsuit.

It is also important to note that the City had an expert witness who looked at all of the data and concluded that it was driver error that was the problem. In the end, however, the City decided to settle because they thought the case against them was too strong. But it is still an open question about whether this is liability issue or driver error.

Mr. Linke stated the City's recent actions to address liability and safety issues are as follows:

1. February 2011 – Installed speed feedback signs and additional signage to slow drivers and warn them of the presence of residential driveways.
2. February 8, 2011 – City Council meeting where staff presented options to the City Council to eliminate two-way left turn lanes (authorized) and the elimination of parking lanes (not authorized).
3. March 22, 2011 – City Council meeting where the February 8th plan was abandoned in favor of expedited road diet to be followed by further traffic calming.
4. Minimal information provided to public on road diet aspect.

Mr. Linke stated that his goal was to introduce himself to the TSC since he will probably be at future meetings. He would like the city to consider design alternatives that aren't as impactful as a road diet and keeping the four travel lanes open. He would like the city to use a more scientific approach by predefining the goals before the start of the study. He would also like to share the data from the Phase 1 study with the TSC, such as current traffic counts and accident rates.

Commissioner Cumming indicated that he had never met Mr. Linke before the other night. He handed out a memo to Mr. Linke stating they had an exparte exchange by email which he has now shared for the record.

Melvin Franks, 2456 Torrejon Place, Carlsbad, stated that he had noticed from one of the handouts that there seemed to be a lot of traffic accidents until you realize that in 2006 there were only 7 traffic accidents on La Costa Avenue. In 2007 there were only 11 accidents; 2008 had 11 accidents; 2009 had 4 accidents; 2010 had 7 accidents; and in 2011 so far there have been 3 accidents on La Costa Avenue. Those accidents represent a very small percentage of the total volume cars that flow on La Costa Avenue on an average day. That is a very low percentage for a road that handles somewhere between 17,000-19,000 vehicles per day.

He felt some of the data given out was skewed, because it makes it look like there is a tremendous amount of problems on La Costa Avenue. There is a sidewalk that goes from Rancho Santa Fe down to El Camino Real on one side of the street. Admittedly, bike lanes are probably non-existent. Foliage sticks out from the roads and driveways where you can't see beyond. At the public meeting the other night, it was mentioned that La Costa Avenue is a secondary arterial. El Norte Parkway in Escondido is also a secondary highway. It has a median, but for about 3 miles vehicles enter the street from driveways. It is no different than La Costa Avenue. He read the whole report and he feels that taking away the approved left turn lane will make it very difficult for the people who want to turn off into any one of the side streets. The center lane for him, coming off of Rancho Santa Fe Road, is very necessary. He doesn't like to use Levante Street because of the children and the school, a lot of stop signs, and the narrowness of the road. The accident rate is very low considering the amount of traffic. The center turn lane is very good to have.

Seeing no others wishing to speak, Chair Roney closed Public Testimony.

DISCUSSION

Vice-Chair Gallagher asked for clarification about the statement Mr. Linke made that City Council had authorized the elimination of the two-way left turn lane but did not authorize the elimination of the on-street parking. Was that correct? Was there a plan at one time to close down the two-way left turn lane and make everyone come out of their driveways and turn only right?

Mr. Bilse said our City Attorney directed staff to come up with alternatives that would reduce liability as much as possible. Staff had a very short turnaround time to prepare the alternatives. They presented to City Council two concepts that would be relatively quick to implement, which were to change the two-way left turn lane into a painted median and to eliminate the on-street parking. Together, these two concepts could be a good interim solution. City Council chose to authorize the painted median but not the parking restriction. Upon investigation, staff identified potential issues with the painted median concept. All of the signalized intersections on La Costa Avenue prohibit u-turns, but the unsignalized intersections do not. Staff determined that u-turns at all intersections on La Costa Avenue may have to be prohibited due to roadway width, which would have a significant impact on drivers.

Staff went back to City Council and the City Attorney said that immediate action was required, so staff presented an interim striping plan that reduced the number of lanes from two to one. The City Attorney determined that an Environmental Report was needed before implementation of the interim striping plan.

Vice-Chair Gallagher understood the issues confronting staff from both sides. The reason he asked the question was in the proposed interim striping plan that the TSC looked at last month, there was a two-way left turn lane that still existed. But the record shows the City Council has said it is possible to do away with the two-way left turn lane, and now perhaps, we still have a two-way left turn lane. Does that put the City in an awkward situation where the City Council said it is authorized to eliminate it in order to prohibit all of the turnings, and now are possibly voiding doing that.

Chair Roney indicated that he didn't think we should speculate.

Mr. Bilse stated the first alternative was a painted median *and* a parking restriction. But when City Council split the two concepts to just a painted median, sight distance issue was no longer addressed.

Commissioner Cress asked if there was a direct correlation between allowable speed limit and sight distance. What is the minimum sight distance we're talking about along La Costa Avenue?

Mr. Bilse said there is a correlation in that the faster you drive, the more time you need to stop and the more distance you need to stop. For a given speed, you have a given sight distance.

Commissioner Cress stated that right now we don't conform to that. If the speed limit had been 30 miles per hour along La Costa Avenue, would that have eliminated the liability for the accident they're talking about?

Mr. Bilse indicated the road was designed for 40 miles per hour. He wasn't sure if that was with on-street parking and two lanes in each direction. The sight distance may have been different when the street was originally designed, because vehicles have become more efficient and sight distance different.

Commissioner Cress asked if we lowered the speed limit along La Costa Avenue to 40 miles per hour, would that solve the liability issue. Would that put us within the sight distance requirements? When we set our speed limits, they have to be based upon the speed survey, but there is that one caveat that you can make the speed limit lower if the Traffic Engineer determines that there are extenuating circumstances. Is minimum sight distance enough of an extenuating circumstance to lower the speed limit?

Mr. Bilse said the exact terminology is 'not readily apparent to the driver,' and sight distance has not been accepted in the courts as something that is not readily apparent.

Commissioner Cumming recalled that Mr. Linke remarked that traffic volumes had been unchanged over the years. We have La Costa Towne Center coming, so will that create additional traffic demand along La Costa Avenue? As he recalled, when City Council was looking at this issue, one of the concerns was that there were two businesses (out of their homes) operating along La Costa Avenue and they needed on-street parking for the employees. He wondered if the businesses couldn't provide off-street parking for their employees. He thought that was a factor in the thinking of the Council.

Mr. Bilse concluded that he hoped he has brought the TSC up-to-date on what staff is doing on this project. The Commission should feel comfortable about their approach and understand it and what they are trying to achieve.

Mr. Kim wanted to reiterate for the Commissioners and the public that if they want to get involved with the La Costa Avenue Improvement Plan process, the proper venue would be those public meetings.

ITEM 6B: Investigate the need to install a stop sign on Calle San Felipe at Calle Posada.

Mr. Kim stated this item is to investigate the need to install a stop sign on Calle San Felipe at Calle Posada. Calle San Felipe intersects Calle Posada in a T-intersection configuration in a residential area with Calle San Felipe being considered the “stem” of the T-intersection and Calle Posada considered the “top” of the T-intersection.

Each stop sign request received by staff is analyzed based on standards and guidelines found in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. Stop signs, if improperly used, can cause substantial inconvenience to drivers and should be used only where justified. One of the conditions that may warrant consideration of installing a stop sign on the minor street is when the safe approach speed to the intersection is less than 10 miles per hour, which occurs when there is a restricted visibility for the driver.

For the analyses of local streets, the minor street decision point location is assumed to be 50 feet from the intersection assuming the vehicle on the minor street has an approach speed of 10 miles per hour. A distance of 150 feet (stopping sight distance for 25 miles per hour) along the major street should be provided to minor street drivers to view vehicles approaching the intersection.

At the study intersection, the sight distance from Calle San Felipe looking to the east was measured to be 127 feet, which is less than the required 150 feet. The sight distance limitation is due to landscaping on private property on the northeast corner of the intersection. Sight distance looking to the west was found to be 190 feet, which is more than the 150 foot minimum requirement. The above-stated sight distance measurements do not consider parked vehicles within the line of sight. Sight distance is further reduced when any vehicles park on the north side of Calle Posada adjacent to the intersection.

Based on these findings, staff determined that the 10 mile per hour safe approach speed criteria is not being met for southbound Calle San Felipe drivers and a stop sign can be considered for installation on Calle San Felipe at Calle Posada. The Traffic Safety Coordinating Committee (TSCC) requested that staff investigate whether or not the restrictive vegetation could be trimmed or removed prior to proceeding with the installation of a stop sign on Calle San Felipe at Calle Posada. Based on a field evaluation, staff has determined that the large palm trees on the northeast corner cannot be trimmed nor would it be practicable to remove them.

Derived from the findings contained in this report, the TSCC recommends the installation of a stop sign on Calle San Felipe at its intersection with Calle Posada. This would include a striped limit line and “STOP” pavement legend placed on the roadway.

ACTION: Motion by Commissioner Cress, and duly seconded by Commissioner Valderrama, to install a stop sign on Calle San Felipe at its intersection with Calle Posada. This would include a striped limit line and "STOP" pavement legend placed on the roadway.

VOTE: 5-0-0

AYES: Roney, Gallagher, Valderrama, Cress, Cumming

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Commissioner Cumming indicated he wanted to bring attention to the fact that on the intersection at Calle Posada and Calle Vallarta the stop sign is largely obscured by vegetation. It is possible that a motorist might not see the stop sign until the last second and could be hazardous.

Mr. Kim said he would look at the mentioned intersection and address the problem.

ITEM 6C: Approve the proposed revisions to the Carlsbad Residential Traffic Management Program.

Mr. Kim indicated this item is the proposed revisions to the Carlsbad Residential Traffic Management Program (CRTMP). At their meeting of December 7, 2009, the TSC received a staff report by Doug Bilse regarding proposed revisions to the CRTMP. The proposed revisions included cost effective traffic management features such as resident Stop signs, speed cushions, speed tables and striping, as well as a project scoring criteria for consideration of the more expensive traditional traffic calming features. These proposed revisions addressed concerns expressed by City Council regarding the current program. After consideration of the staff report and public testimony, the TSC voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposed revisions to the CRTMP.

However, on January 19, 2010, City Council directed staff to initiate pilot projects on Donna Drive and Sierra Morena Avenue to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed cost effective measures prior to revising the program. The pilot projects on Donna Drive and Sierra Morena Avenue have since been completed. The specific improvements that were installed as part of the pilot projects, as well as the results of implementation, were sent to the City Manager on March 16, 2011. Staff is now proposing to finalize the revisions to the CRTMP based on the results of the pilot projects. Mr. Kim reviewed the pilot project results with the TSC.

The revisions for the CRTMP proposed by staff in December 2009 (prior to the pilot projects) are summarized as follows: The December 2009 Revision of the CRTMP was a four-phase process. Phase I was essentially unchanged. Phase II included cost-effective traffic management features. There was recommended criteria to determine eligibility for each phase of the program. There was a point system and criteria for Phase III/IV.

Based on staff's experience with the pilot project, they had some minor changes to the Traffic Management Program that was presented to TSC in 2009. The revisions for the CRTMP proposed by staff in May 2011 (after the pilot projects) are summarized as follows: The May 2011 Revision of the CRTMP is a three-phase process. Phase III Project Scoring has been slightly modified to focus on speed. Funding must now be secured prior to embarking on Phase III public input process. Speed cushions and speed tables are included as Phase II features.

Based on the results of the pilot projects on both Donna Drive and Sierra Morena Avenue, the TSCC recommends the approval of the proposed revisions to the CRTMP.

DISCUSSION

Chair Roney asked what the community feedback was from the residents of the two pilot projects.

Mr. Kim indicated the community was very positive. There was some frustration regarding Sierra Morena Avenue with the original request to install stop signs. The stop sign request was turned down and we went through this long process and ended up giving the community stop signs three years later. Unfortunately there was some level of frustration with the time process. Overall, however, after we implemented the pilot projects, staff did not receive complaints other than one person who thought it was excessive, that we didn't need to spend money on a speeding problem that did not exist.

Vice-Chair Gallagher indicated that on the second page of the handout where it states "executive summary," he thought there was a typo on the third paragraph. It says: "After review and evaluating programs from many cities, the committee recommended a program . . ." He felt something was missing there.

Mr. Kim saw what he was referring to and he said he would remedy it.

Vice-Chair Gallagher asked where the points are scored for the traffic volumes on page 11, does each road stand on its own merit. How does staff evaluate a small street within other streets that are going to be considered for traffic calming all in the same area?

Mr. Kim stated that although it is not spelled out, staff's intention was for areas that included more than one street that staff would take the worst scenario street. They would do measurements on multiple streets, but they would use the candidate street that had the most results in terms of a score.

Vice-Chair Gallagher stated it was a little unclear when he was looking at that. If a street has an ADT of 1,000 vehicles, do you divide that by 100 to get 10 points?

Mr. Kim indicated he was correct.

ACTION:	Motion by Commissioner Cumming, and duly seconded by Commissioner Cress, to approve the proposed revisions to the Carlsbad Residential Traffic Management Program with the correction noted by Vice-Chair Gallagher.
VOTE:	5-0-0
AYES:	Roney, Gallagher, Valderrama, Cress, Cumming
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Mr. Kim added it has been a two-three year process to revise the traffic calming program. In that time, staff has informed requestors that were under the current process that they are on temporary hold, because City Council was not going to fund the more expensive traffic calming features. These candidate streets have been on hold and have been waiting to have a revised document so they can be considered for the cost-effective features. That list has grown to approximately 17 streets and they need to determine an order in which to address the streets. Based on staff load and the ability of street crews, he felt they cannot address all 17 streets in one year. The question is what order to address the list of 17 streets.

Jim Murray will present a recommendation that staff has to look at the streets in the queue and to suggest a way to evaluate them. Staff would like the Traffic Safety Commission to consider staff's proposal and make an appropriate recommendation.

Mr. Murray stated that over the last two years, staff has been working on two pilot programs and the proposed revisions to the CRTMP that was outlined. Staff compiled a waiting list of 17 streets. The issue is how to address the streets in a ranking order of severity as opposed to chronologically. Staff is recommending using the project scoring listed below that is in the proposed revisions to the plan.

CRTMP Project Scoring:

1. Travel Speed (max. 40 points)
 - 6 points for each mile per hour that the 85th percentile speed is over 32 mph.
2. Traffic Volumes (max. 30 points)
 - ADT divided by 100 or peak hour volume divided by 10.
3. Collision History (max. 15 points)
 - Five points for each correctable collision.
4. Sidewalks (max. 5 points)
 - 5 points if no sidewalk.

5. School Proximity (max. 5 points)
 - 5 points if school grounds adjacent to the candidate street.
 - 3 points if candidate street is within 500' of school grounds.
 - 1 point if candidate street is located within 1,000' of school grounds.
6. Pedestrian Crossings (max. 5 points)
 - 5 points if crosswalk is located on street.

Mr. Murray indicated staff would need to get critical speed data and volume data for each of the streets in order to accomplish that. Of the existing 17 streets on the chronological street list, 7 of them already have the critical speed and volume data. The point assignment for the seven streets are as follows:

Candidate Streets (order based on points):

- | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----------|
| 1. | Magnolia Avenue | 63 points |
| 2. | Esfera Street | 56 points |
| 3. | Levante Street | 53 points |
| 4. | Chestnut Avenue | 51 points |
| 5. | Pontiac Drive | 36 points |
| 6. | Daisy Avenue | 36 points |
| 7. | Xana Way | 21 points |

Staff is proposing to address the candidate streets in the order based on the points system described above and they would like the TSC's input on this issue. Staff would need to obtain critical speed and volume data for the remaining 10 streets on the list. In a one-year time period, staff could probably do from 3 to 5 streets. That's why it is important to have some kind of ranking on the 17 streets.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Cress asked how long it would take to complete the points criteria on the other 10 streets.

Mr. Murray indicated speed surveys and volume counts would have to be conducted, so it would probably take a few months to complete.

Mr. Kim asked Commissioner Cress if his question was to suggest that the TSC would want the complete list of streets and their point assignment. Right now staff is asking for the TSC recommendation on what method staff should use to address the 17 existing streets.

Commissioner Cress thought the point system was a good one.

Commissioner Cumming also thought the point system was a good one based on need. Did the seven streets on which staff does have data surface in the past because of attributes of a good reason why they stood out and were therefore measured before the other streets? Looking at Levante Street Street, they know that La Costa Avenue and Levante Street have become a package. It is a dynamic situation. Are any of the other streets that unique?

Mr. Kim indicated the point system would establish a list of order, but as Commissioner Cumming stated, there may be some situations in which that list is going to change slightly.

Chair Roney asked if based on the points system this would just be an overlay, but staff will still have some discretion if there was an emergency issue or something like that?

Mr. Kim stated that was correct.

Vice-Chair Gallagher asked how often these requests were received by staff to be added to the list of 17.

Mr. Kim said 3 or 4 times during the past 6 months or so.

Vice-Chair Gallagher said it sounds like there is a work load consideration. If more requests come in during the next year, what are we going to do with those if staff is already saturated with trying to

get the needed information for the current streets on the list. As he understands it, anything under 51 points does not qualify.

Mr. Kim stated he was correct. Considering Phase III, candidate streets that have been temporarily halted at the end of Phase I were not going further because there is a new revision to the program. So staff will be using the points system in a different way, just to consider what order to address Phase II solutions for these streets.

ACTION: Motion by Commissioner Cress, and duly seconded by Vice-Chair Gallagher, to approve the modification of the motion of the points system as presented.

Commissioner Cumming suggested the possibility that this issue could be continued until next month when the Commissioners had more time to think about it. Since this was not explicitly on the agenda and the public might want to have a say in it, it might be a good idea to hold it over a month.

Mr. Kim said this was a part of the program. It is just a matter of what order we attack these streets. In the past, staff has used their own discretion and judgment as to what streets go first. Based on a suggestion given to staff, they are proposing a different way of addressing them based on need and this was the most logical method that staff could think of.

Chair Roney asked if Commissioner Cress was modifying his motion with the wording of “discretion based on unforeseen conditions that may arise” and Commissioner Cress indicated that he was.

Commissioner Valderrama stated he felt staff did a great job and they should have a say-so when things have to be done. If staff feels something has to be modified, they should be able to use discretion and just do it.

ACTION: Motion by Commissioner Cress, and duly seconded by Vice-Chair Gallagher, to approve the modification of the motion of the points system as presented with the condition that staff can use discretion based on unforeseen conditions that may arise.

VOTE: 5-0-0

AYES: Roney, Gallagher, Valderrama, Cress, Cumming

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ITEM 7: REPORT FROM TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSIONERS

None

ITEM 8: REPORT FROM TRAFFIC ENGINEER

Mr. Kim stated he had a few updates. At the last City Council meeting, the Beech and Ocean stop signs was adopted. The ordinance for the Monroe Street/Gayle Way STOP was introduced and the Loker Avenue speed zone revision was also introduced. The next regularly scheduled Traffic Safety Commission meeting is scheduled to be held on June 6, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT:

By proper motion, Chair Roney adjourned the Regular Meeting of May 2, 2011 at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth Woodbeck".

Ruth Woodbeck
Minutes Clerk